UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,) Case No. CR (5	442 TEN
Plaintiff, v.) STIPULATED ORDER) UNDER THE SPEEDY	
Yolonda Brown Defendant.)))	
Defendant.	j	
For the reasons stated by the parties on the reco Speedy Trial Act from, 2015 to by the continuance outweigh the best interest of 3161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding an	f the public and the defendant in a sp	eedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. §
Failure to grant a continuance we See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i)	ould be likely to result in a miscarria).	ge of justice.
defendants, the nature of or law, that it is unreasonable to	aplex, due to [check applicable reason the prosecution, or the existent expect adequate preparation for pretolished by this section. See 18 U.S.C.	nce of novel questions of fact rial proceedings or the trial
	ould deny the defendant reasonable to of due diligence. See 18 U.S.C. § 31	
	ould unreasonably deny the defendar ommitments, taking into account the v).	• • •
Pailure to grant a continuance we necessary for effective preparation See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(in	ould unreasonably deny the defendar on, taking into account the exercise o v).	of due diligence.FILED
		SEP 18 2015
IT IS SO ORDERED.	and 11	SUSAN Y. SOONG CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALLFORNIA
DATED: 9/18/17	SALLIE KIM United States Magistrat	
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States	Attorney